REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on October 05, 2005. Claims 1-17 and 19 are standing for examination. Claims 1-8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for the invention of the present application being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response to the 101 rejection, applicant provides correction to the claim language as advised by the Examiner to overcome the rejection.

In the Office Action the previous arguments presented by applicant in the last response were persuasive to the Examiner, and new grounds of rejection are raised in the present Action rejecting claims 1-6, 15-16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light in view of the new reference of Burson (U.S. 6,405,245), hereinafter Burson. Claims 7, 9-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light, in view of Burson as applied to claims 1 and 3, and further in view of Jacobs of record. Claims 8, 13 and 17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light in view of Burson as applied to claims 1, 3, 9, 10 and 13, and further in view of Kraft of record.

Applicant has again carefully studied the prior art references provided by the Examiner, including the new reference of Burson, and the Examiner's rejections and statements of the instant Office Action. In response to the merit rejections of applicant's claims, applicant further amends the independent claims to more distinctly claim the subject matter of applicant's invention considered to be patentable subject matter. Applicant provides further argument which will clearly demonstrate that applicant's claims as amended distinguish unarguably over the prior art presented by the Examiner, either singly or in combination.

Applicant amends the independent claims to particularly recite that the notification to the user includes summarized information pertinent to the user, including links to or information from alternate sites not solicited by, or registered to by the user.

In applicant's previous response filed July 27, 2005, applicant amended the claims to specifically recite that the software application provides the notification to the user, and provided substantial arguments that the reference of Light failed to teach applicant's

method for returning notification to the user that includes the result of the form submission and registration attempt, including registration status and user authentication. The Examiner in the instant Office Action has presented the new reference of Burson to teach this deficiency (col. 8, line 1 – col. 9, line 17 of Burson).

Although the new reference of Burson does appear to teach a software application sending notification to the end user, Burson clearly fails to teach that the notification to the user includes summarized information pertinent to the user, including links to or information from alternate sites not solicited by, or registered to by the user.

Now referring to the reference of Burson, the data associated with the personal information (PI) may include a navigation script for guiding an application downloaded to the end user that initiates a connection between the user and the PI provider. Fig. 2 illustrates a client computer 220 which utilizes the Internet to access a PI engine 240 executing on the PI host 290. PI engine 240 is composed of storage and processing components for the PI, and enables the user to register to various sites that provide the PI. Upon successful registration of the user the registration information could be displayed to the user, and in the instance of registration failure, Burson teaches that the user could be presented with the information initially supplied by the user for registration, and a second registration failure resulting from the submission of identical requisite data might result in an error message sent to the user indicating that either the user is ineligible to access the selected PI from the selected PI provider or that alteration by the PI provider may have caused an error in user registration, or could also trigger a warning suggesting a need to potentially reconfigure the record for the PI provider.

The above registration and notification by a software application to the user, and that the notification returned to the user may include results of form submission and registration status and authentication data is therefore fairly taught in Burson according to the portion of the reference cited and applied by the Examiner in his rejection in the instant Office Action of applicant's claims (col. 8, line 1 – col. 9, line 17). But what is clear to applicant is that for PI to be provided for the user, the user must register to the PI provider in advance of any PI being provided for the user.

In contrast however, applicant's invention teaches that if a user requests a

summary about data on one of his sites to which he has already registered, such as, perhaps, current interest rates and re-finance costs at his mortgage site, the service may at its own discretion provide an additional unsolicited summary from an alternate mortgage site for comparison. This type of summarization would be designed to enhance a user's position based on his profile information. In this case, updated data about latest interest rates, stock performances, car prices, airline ticket discounts, and so on would be stored by the service for comparative purposes. If a user request for a summary can be equaled or bettered in terms of any advantage to the user, such summary data may be included.

The method and apparatus of applicant's invention may be used to present summaries to users with minimum or no user input. In this case, as explained above, the user may be assisted by the enterprise in finding a better deal, stock price, mortgage rate and so on, and the user may be presented with summaries from, or links to alternative sites to which the user has not yet registered or subscribed to. If the sites are new to a user, and the user has no registration with the site, then through agreement, or other convention, the service for gathering and presenting the personal information to the user may be provided access to such sites. Such an agreement may be made, for example, if the host of the site realizes a possibility of gaining a new customer if the customer likes the summary information presented.

The sites are parsed for summary data, stored in canonical fashion by the service and the data is compiled and rendered for presentation to the end user on a summary page. The summary containing all of the data is made available to a user and the user is notified of its existence. The clear advantage over the prior art is that is by providing certain information not requested by a user may aid in enhancing a user's organization of is current business on the WEB, and such summarization enhances a user's position based on his profile information.

Applicant therefore strongly believes that independent claims 1, 9, 15 and 19, which have been amended herein to specifically recite that the notification to the user includes summarized information pertinent to the user, including links to or information from alternate sites not solicited by, or registered to by the user, provide the user with clear advantages over the system and method taught in the combined art of Light/Burson,

and now clearly differentiate applicant's invention over the combined art and should be afforded patentable weight by the Examiner.

Claims 7, 9-12 and 14 are rejected as being unpatentable over Light, in view of Burson as applied to claims 1 and 3, and further in view of Jacobs, and claims 8, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Light in view of Burson as applied to claims 1, 3, 9, 10 and 13, and further in view of Kraft. The Examiner has relied on Jacobs in his rejections to simply teach that the functions could be divided among multiple servers and Kraft for teaching a method in which the job order is written in XML.

Claim 9 is an independent claim, and all of the independent claims have been amended herein to be now patentable over the combined art. All of the remaining dependent claims are therefore patentable on their own merits, or at least as dependent from a patentable claim.

As all of applicant's claims as amended and argued above have been shown to be patentable over the combined prior art provided by the Examiner, applicant respectfully requests that this application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and that this case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Anand Rangarajan et al.

By */Donald R. Boys/*
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457